



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/437,278	11/10/1999	WILLIAM J. DONOVAN	33-99-001	7771
5073	7590	10/22/2003	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			PORTER, RACHEL L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/437,278

Applicant(s)

DONOVAN ET AL.

Examiner

Rachel L. Porter

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14-20 and 24-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14-20 and 24-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3626

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Notice to the Applicant*

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed 7/23/03. Claims 2-4, 7,8,10,11,14-20, and 24-30 are pending. Claims 7,20,24,26 and 29 have been amended.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 24,3-4,29,14-15,19-20,25,27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohannon et al (USPN 6,125,371—referred to hereinafter as Bohannon) and Dettelbach et al (USPN 5,523,166).

Claim 24) Bohannon teaches a system, comprising:

- a data store; and (col. 4, lines 4-26)
- a server coupled to the data store, the server: (col. 4, lines 4-26)
  - o receiving from a service provider a first record relating to a first type of record, the first record comprising attributes and a first version number; (Figure 1; col. 3, lines 52-60— Any file (i.e. any format) may be received and accommodated by the system.)

- associating the first reservation record with a first time stamp; (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48)
- adding the first reservation record and time stamp to the data store using the first reservation record format; (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48- Any file may be accommodated and no conversion process occurs in the storing process.)
- receiving from a service provider a second record relating to the first type of record (e.g. update to the record/file), the second record comprising at least a portion of the attributes associated with the first reservation record and a second version number different from the first version number, (Figure 1; col. 3, lines 52-60; col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48)
- associating the second reservation record with a second time stamp; (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48)
- adding the second reservation record and time stamp to the data store using the second reservation record format. (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48: Any file may be accommodated and no conversion process occurs in the storing process.)

Bohannon further discloses that the system provides timestamps and version numbers for the records. Bohannon does not expressly teach the specific data recited in claims (i.e. that the records/files contain reservation data or travel attributes).

Moreover, Bohannon does not expressly disclose that the formats from the service provider contain different file types with travel attributes arranged in different formats. However, Bohannon does disclose that the system/method accommodates any file,

Art Unit: 3626

entry, record, field, item, or other data associated with at least one database (col. 3, lines 57-60). Dettelbach teaches a system wherein information from a single service provider (i.e. queue file Q99) contains a plurality of reservation file types (e.g. customer data, hotel, air, car, departure authorization) with travel attributes arranged in different formats. (col. 4, lines 41-52, line 60-col. 6, lines 15) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bohannon with the teachings of Dettelbach to accommodate various types of data, including travel/ reservations data. One would have been motivated to include reservation data among the types of data accommodated by the Bohannon system to provide an efficient means to logically and economically age reservation data record versions in the main memory of a database, thereby allowing memory space to be reclaimed as it is needed. (Bohannon: col. 2, lines 48-52)

Claim 3) Bohannon and Dettelbach in combination teach a system for storing travel reservation data comprising a computer (i.e. server) coupled to a data store. Bohannon further discloses that the system provides timestamps and version numbers for the records. Bohannon and Dettelbach do not expressly teach the specific data recited in claims (i.e. that the wherein the second reservation record comprises travel reservation data associated with a city pair.) However, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements of the system. In other words, the recited steps are not specific to and do not require that the data is reservation or travel data. (e.g. No travel reservations are made requiring the recited data; no actual pricing

Art Unit: 3626

manipulations are performed requiring the recited data.) Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP § 2106. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Bohannon and Dettelbach to accommodate various types of data, including reservations data associated with city pair. One would have been motivated to include reservation data among the types of data accommodated by Bohannon and Dettelbach in combination to provide an efficient means to logically and economically age reservation data record versions in the main memory of a database, thereby allowing memory space to be reclaimed as it is needed. (Bohannon: col. 2, lines 48-52)

Claim 4) Bohannon teaches a system wherein the second record is added to the data store by using the time stamp as a key into a database. (col. 5, lines 19-48; col. 6, lines 18-31; col. 8, lines 13-44)

Claim 29) Bohannon teaches a method for organizing data, comprising:

- receiving from a service provider a first record relating to a first type of record, the first record comprising attributes and a first version number, the attributes arranged in a first record format; (Figure 1; col. 3, lines 52-60— Any file (i.e. any format) may be received and accommodated by the system.)
- associating the first reservation record with a first time stamp; (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48)

Art Unit: 3626

- adding the first reservation record and time stamp to a data store using the first reservation record format; (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48-no file conversion takes place in process of storing)
- receiving from a service provider a second reservation record relating to the first type of record, the second reservation record comprising at least a portion of the attributes associated with the first reservation record and a second version number different from the first version number, (Figure 1; col. 3, lines 52-60; col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48 )
- associating the second reservation record with a second time stamp; and (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48)
- adding the second reservation record and time stamp to the data store using the second reservation record format. (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48-Any file may be accommodated. Also, no conversion process takes place.)

Bohannon teaches a method for storing a plurality of records in a data store and further discloses that the system/method provides timestamps and version numbers for the records. Bohannon does not expressly teach the specific data recited in claims (i.e. that the records/files contain reservation data or travel attributes). Moreover, Bohannon does not expressly disclose that the formats from the service provider contain different file types with travel attributes arranged in different formats. However, Bohannon does disclose that the system/method accommodates any file, entry, record, field, item, or other data associated with at least one database (col. 3, lines 57-60). Dettelbach teaches a system wherein information from a single service provider (i.e. queue file

Art Unit: 3626

Q99) contains a plurality of reservation file types (e.g. customer data, hotel, air, car, departure authorization) with travel attributes arranged in different formats. (col. 4, lines 41-52, line 60-col. 6, lines 15) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bohannon with the teachings of Dettelbach to accommodate various types of data, including travel/reservations data. One would have been motivated to include reservation data among the types of data accommodated by the Bohannon system to provide an efficient means to logically and economically age reservation data record versions in the main memory of a database. (Bohannon: col. 2, lines 48-52)

Claim 14) Bohannon and Dettelbach teach a travel information system comprising a computer (i.e. server) coupled to a data store. Bohannon further discloses that the method provides timestamps and version numbers for the stored records. Bohannon does not expressly teach the specific data recited in claims (i.e. that the wherein the second reservation record comprises travel reservation data associated with a city pair.) However, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements of the system. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. In other words, as presently recited, the steps in the recited method are not specific to and do not require that the data is reservation or travel data. (e.g. No travel reservations are made requiring the recited data; no actual pricing manipulations are performed requiring the recited data.) Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of



Art Unit: 3626

patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP § 2106. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Bohannon to accommodate various types of data, including travel/ reservations data. One would have been motivated to include reservation data among the types of data accommodated by the Bohannon system to provide an efficient means to logically and economically age reservation data record versions in the main memory of a database, thereby allowing memory space to be reclaimed as it is needed. (Bohannon: col. 2, lines 48-52)

Claim 15) Bohannon and Dettelbach teach a method of claim 29, wherein the second record is added to the data store by using the time stamp as a key into a database. (col. 5, lines 19-48; col. 6, lines 18-31; col. 8, lines 13-44)

Claim 19) As per claim 19, Bohannon teaches a method of retrieving and storing multiple versions of data files wherein the data may be indexed by various file attributes (e.g. by version number or timestamp) (col. 4, line 47-col. 5, line 48). However, Bohannon does not expressly disclose that the system stores travel/reservation data or information on city pairs. Dettelbach teaches a method of retrieving and storing travel reservation data that includes information on city pairs (Figures 3-4 and 6). At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Bohannon with the teaching of Dettelbach to index reservation data files by various file attributes, for example by city pair. One would have been motivated to index the data using various attributes of the data (i.e. city pair or city pair,

time stamp, version number) so that the system's users could easily customize the organization and retrieval of the stored data files to suit individual preferences.

Claim 20) Bohannon teaches a system comprising a computer (i.e. server) coupled to a data store. Bohannon further discloses that the system provides timestamps and version numbers for the first and second records and wherein the records comprise attributes. Bohannon does not expressly teach the specific data recited in claims (i.e. wherein the attributes comprise one selected from the group consisting of fares associated with the service provider, rules associated with the service provider, and restrictions associated with the service provider.) However, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements of the system. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. In other words, as presently recited, the steps in the recited method are not specific to and do not require that the data is reservation or travel data. (e.g. No travel reservations are made requiring the recited data; no actual pricing manipulations are performed requiring the recited data.) Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP § 2106. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Bohannon to accommodate various types of data, including travel/ reservations data. One would have been motivated to include reservation data among the types of data

Art Unit: 3626

accommodated by the Bohannon system to provide an efficient means to logically and economically age reservation data record versions in the main memory of a database, thereby allowing memory space to be reclaimed as it is needed. (Bohannon: col. 2, lines 48-52)

Claim 25) As per claim 25, the limitations of the present claim substantially duplicate of the limitations of claim 24, with its first and second reservation data records, first and second data formats, timestamps and version numbers. Claim 25 recites differs in that it recites an additional (i.e. third) reservation record with a version number, and a third format, and further recites that the reservation data relates to the second reservation record. Since, the courts have broadly held that the duplication of parts/steps is obvious *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), it is respectfully submitted that these changes do not present a patentable distinction over the applied prior art of record. The limitations of claim 24 have been shown to be obvious over the system disclosed by Bohannon and Dettelbach in combination, which accommodates any type of file (i.e. format) associated with a database. Therefore, claim 25 is rejected for the same reasons provided in the rejection of claim 24 and incorporated herein.

Claim 27) Bohannon teaches a system Bohannon teaches a system comprising a computer (i.e. server) coupled to a data store. Bohannon further discloses that the system provides timestamps and version numbers for first and second records, which allow files to be modified/updated while preserving previous versions of the record (i.e. copying a second version without modifying previous attributes) (col. 4, lines 10-26). Bohannon does not expressly teach the specific data recited in claims (i.e. that the first

Art Unit: 3626

and second records include first rule data and second rule data). However, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements of the system. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *MPEP* § 2106. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Bohannon to accommodate various types of data, including travel/ reservations data. One would have been motivated to include reservation data among the types of data accommodated by the Bohannon/Dettelbach system to provide an efficient means to logically and economically age reservation data record versions in the main memory of a database, thereby allowing memory space to be reclaimed as it is needed. (Bohannon: col. 2, lines 48-52)

Claim 30) As per claim 30, the limitations of the present claim substantially duplicate of the limitations of claim 29, with its first and second reservation data records, first and second data formats, timestamps and version numbers. Claim 30 differs in that it recites an additional (i.e. third) reservation record with a version number, and a third format, and further recites that the reservation data relates to the second reservation record. Since, the courts have broadly held that the duplication of parts/steps is

Art Unit: 3626

obvious *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), it is respectfully submitted that these changes do not present a patentable distinction over the applied prior art of record. The limitations of claim 29 have been shown to be obvious over the system disclosed by Bohannon, which accommodates any type (i.e. any format) of file. Therefore, claim 30 is rejected for the same reasons provided in the rejection of claim 29 and incorporated herein.

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohannon and Dettelbach, and further in view of Official Notice.

Claim 16) Bohannon teaches method of claim 29 as explained in the rejection of claim 29. Bohannon further discloses that the system/method accommodates any type of file, (col. 3, lines 57-60), but does not specifically disclose that the system/method processes different types/formats of data records using Prolog. However, it is respectfully submitted that the use of Prolog is old and well known in the computer arts. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system/method of Bohannon so that different types of files (e.g. formats of files) are processed using Prolog. One would have been motivated to include this feature to provide an efficient means to logically and economically process (e.g. age) reservation data record versions in the main memory of a database. (Bohannon: col. 2, lines 48-52)

Art Unit: 3626

5. Claims 26,7,8,10,11,17,18, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohannon and Dettelbach and further in view of Barney (USPN 6,212,512).

Claim 2) Bohannon and Dettelbach teach system for organizing, versioning, and storing first and second records as explained in the rejection of claim 24. However, Bohannon does not specifically disclose that files are added to the data store by flat file appendage. Barney discloses that the addition of files to a data store by flat file (i.e. flat file appendage) is well known in the art. (col. 3, lines 18-24) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bohannon and Dettelbach in combination with the teaching of Barney to allow files to be added to the data store by flat file chronologically using the timestamp. One would have been motivated to do this to facilitate the storage and retrieval of the desired information according to user preferences. (Barney: col. 8, lines 5-63)

Claim 26) Bohannon teaches a system, comprising:

- a data store; and (col. 4, lines 4-26)
- a server coupled to the data store, the server (col. 4, lines 4-26):
  - o receiving from a service provider a first record relating to a first type of record, the first reservation record comprising attributes and a first version number, the attributes arranged in a first record format; (Figure 1; col. 3, lines 52-60— Any file (i.e. any format) may be accommodated.)

Art Unit: 3626

- associating the first record with a first time stamp; (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48)
- adding the first reservation record and time stamp to the data store using the first reservation record format; (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48--no file conversion takes place in process of storing)
- receiving from a service provider a second record relating to the first type of record, the second record comprising at least a portion of the attributes associated with the first reservation record and a second version number different from the first version number, (Figure 1; col. 3, lines 52-60; col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48 —Any file (i.e. any format) may be accommodated.)
- associating the second reservation record with a second time stamp; and (Figure 1, col. 4, line 55-col. 5, line 48)
- adding the second reservation record and time stamp to the data store using the second reservation record format, (Any file may be accommodated. Also, no conversion process takes place) wherein the first reservation record and the second reservation record are added chronologically using the time stamp. (col. 5, line 19-col. 6, line 67)

Bohannon further discloses that the system provides timestamps and version numbers for the records. Bohannon does not expressly teach the specific data recited in claims (i.e. that the records/files contain reservation data or travel attributes).

Moreover, Bohannon does not expressly disclose that the formats from a service provider contain different file types with travel attributes arranged in different formats.

Art Unit: 3626

However, Bohannon does disclose that the system/method accommodates any file, entry, record, field, item, or other data associated with at least one database (col. 3, lines 57-60). Dettelbach teaches a system wherein information from a single service provider (i.e. queue file Q99) contains a plurality of reservation file types (e.g. customer data, hotel, air, car, departure authorization) with travel attributes arranged in different formats. (col. 4, lines 41-52, line 60-col. 6, lines 15) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bohannon with the teachings of Dettelbach to accommodate various types of data, including travel/ reservations data. One would have been motivated to include reservation data among the types of data accommodated by the Bohannon system to provide an efficient means to logically and economically age reservation data record versions in the main memory of a database, thereby allowing memory space to be reclaimed as it is needed. (Bohannon: col. 2, lines 48-52)

Also, Bohannon teaches a system wherein files may be arranged chronologically by timestamp, but does not specifically disclose that files are added to the data store by flat file appendage. Barney discloses that the addition of files to a data store by flat file (i.e. flat file appendage) is well known in the art. (col. 3, lines 18-24) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bohannon and Dettelbach in combination with the teaching of Barney to allow files to be added to the data store by flat file chronologically using the timestamp. One would have been motivated to do this to facilitate the storage



Art Unit: 3626

and retrieval of the desired information according to user preferences. (Barney: col. 8, lines 5-63)

Claim 7) Bohannon teaches a system comprising a computer (i.e. server) coupled to a data store. Bohannon further discloses that the method provides timestamps and version numbers for first and second records. Bohannon does not expressly teach the specific data recited in claims (i.e. wherein the travel attributes comprise old and new fare data associated with the service provider.) However, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements of the system. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. In other words, the recited steps in the method are not specific to and do not require that the data is reservation or travel data. (e.g. No travel reservations are made requiring the recited data; no actual pricing manipulations are performed requiring the recited data.) Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP § 2106. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Bohannon and Dettelbach in combination to accommodate various types of data, including fare data. One would have been motivated to include reservation data among the types of data accommodated by the Bohannon system to provide an efficient means to logically and economically age reservation data record versions in the main memory of a database,

Art Unit: 3626

thereby allowing memory space to be reclaimed as it is needed. (Bohannon: col. 2, lines 48-52)

Claim 8) Bohannon and Dettelbach teach the system of claim 7 as explained in the rejection of claim 7. Furthermore, Bohannon teaches a method of retrieving and storing multiple versions of data files wherein the data may be indexed various file attributes (e.g. by version number or timestamp) (col. 4, line 47-col. 5, line 48).

However, Bohannon does not expressly disclose that the system stores travel/reservation data or information on city pairs. Dettelbach teaches a method of retrieving and storing travel reservation data that includes information on city pairs and carriers (Figures 3-4 and 6). At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Bohannon with the teaching of Dettelbach to index reservation data files by various file attributes, for example by city pair. One would have been motivated to index the data using various attributes of the data (i.e. city pair, carrier, time stamp, version number) so that the system's users could easily customize the organization and retrieval of the stored data files to suit individual preferences.

Claim 10) Bohannon, Dettelbach and Barney teach the system of claim 26 as explained in the rejection of claim 26. Furthermore, Bohannon teaches a method of retrieving and storing multiple versions of data files wherein the data may be indexed various file attributes (e.g. by version number or timestamp) (col. 4, line 47-col. 5, line 48). However, Bohannon does not expressly disclose that the system stores travel/reservation data or information on city pairs and carriers. Dettelbach teaches a

Art Unit: 3626

method of retrieving and storing travel reservation data that includes information on city pairs (Figures 3-4 and 6). At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Bohannon with the teaching of Dettelbach to index reservation data files by various file attributes, for example by city pair and/or carrier. One would have been motivated to index the data using various attributes of the data (i.e. city pair or city pair, time stamp, version number) so that the system's users could easily customize the organization and retrieval of the stored data files to suit individual preferences.

Claim 11) Bohannon teaches a system of claim 26, wherein the time stamp comprises an activation stamp that indicates when the server can initially use the second record. (col. 5, lines 5-48, line 59-col. 6, line 45)

Claim 17) Bohannon teaches the method of claim 29 as explained in the rejection of claim 29. Bohannon further discloses a method wherein files may be added to the data store chronologically using the timestamp, but does not expressly disclose the use of flat file appendage (col. 5, line 19-col. 6, line 67). Barney discloses that the addition of files to a data store by flat file (i.e. flat file appendage) is well known in the art. (col. 3, lines 18-24) At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bohannon and Dettelbach in combination with the teaching of Barney to allow files to be added to the data store by flat file chronologically using the timestamp. One would have been motivated to do this to facilitate the storage and retrieval of the desired information according to user preferences. (Barney: col. 8, lines 5-63)

Art Unit: 3626

Claim 18) As per claim 18, Bohannon teaches the method of organizing, versioning, and adding data to a data store as explained in the rejection of claim 29, but does not specifically disclose synchronizing the data with an additional server. Barney teaches a system of synchronizing the files/records with across multiple data storage units (i.e. an additional server). (Figures 9A-B; 13B; col. 3, lines 54-63; col. 14, line 35-col. 15, line 15; col. 16, line 56-col. 18, line 32) The system allows users to check copies of records across various data stores and to copy the same version of these files across the various data stores. At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bohannon and Dettelbach in combination with the teaching of Barney to allow the files (i.e. the second data file) to be synchronized with an additional server. As suggested by Barney, one would have been motivated to do this to provide a simple and efficient method for protecting system data. (col. 1, line 65- col. 2, line 14)

Claim 28) As per claim 28, the limitations of the present claim substantially duplicate of the limitations of claim 26, with its first and second reservation data records, first and second data formats, timestamps and version numbers. Claim 28 differs in that it recites an additional (i.e. third) reservation record with a version number, and a third format, and further recites that the reservation data relates to the second reservation record. Since, the courts have broadly held that the duplication of parts/steps is obvious *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), it is respectfully submitted that these changes do not present a patentable distinction over the applied prior art of record. The limitations of claim 26 have been shown to be obvious over the

system disclosed by Bohannon, which accommodates any type of file/data records. Therefore, claim 28 is rejected for the same reasons provided in the rejection of claim 26 and incorporated herein.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. The new grounds of rejection provided above address the applicant's arguments in the response filed 7/23/03.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- DeMarcken (USPN 6,377,932) discloses a travel planning method and system for validating pricing solutions.
- Crouse (USPN 5,764,972) discloses a method and system for archiving remote files across a plurality of servers.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3626


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel L. Porter whose telephone number is 703-305-0108. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (703)305-9588. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.

RP  
RP  
October 19, 2003

  
JOSEPH THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600